



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/572,083	09/19/2006	Feng Wei	5706-000003/US/NP	9847
27572 7590 10/09/2007 HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. BOX 828 BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303			EXAMINER ANDERSON, HEATHER L	
			ART UNIT 1655	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/09/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/572,083

Applicant(s)

WEI ET AL.

Examiner

Heather Anderson

Art Unit

1655

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 March 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03/16/2006.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 1655

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-10 are presented for examination on the merits.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed March 16, 2006 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Claim Objections

Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities: typographical error resulting in no clear division between each radix extract and their constituents. There is an additional typographical error of "saponinssaid." Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 2-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 1655

Claims 2-7 are rendered vague and indefinite due to not identifying the type percentages used (i.e., w/w %, w/v % or v/v%).

Claim 8 is rendered vague and indefinite because it recites that the composition is "injection, tablets, ... etc." As the composition is not an injection itself in addition to the other items listed, it is suggested that the claim be amended to state "wherein it is in the dosage form of an injection, tablets, ... etc." or other similar clarification.

Claim 9 is rendered vague and indefinite because it is unclear what an "injection powder" would be. It is not a term that is recognized by one of skill in the art, and there is no further guidance in the specification as to what exactly Applicant means by this term.

Claim 10 provides for the use of the composition in claim 1 wherein it is for the treatment of cardiovascular and cerebrovascular diseases, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under

Art Unit: 1655

35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Guo et al.

(CN 1375316, Derwent abstract provided).

A composition comprising Radix Salviae Miltiorrhizae (*Salvia miltiorrhiza*) extract, Radix Notoginseng (*Panax notoginseng* or *Panax pseudoginseng*), Radix Astragali (*Astragalus* species) extract and borneol or oil of Lignum Dalbergiae Odoriferae (oil of *Dalbergia* wood or jiangxiang) is claimed. It is noted that each of the radix components are defined in the specification such that, "the content of the extracts falls within the scopes [of chemical compounds] as listed" (see page 5, lines 27-29, page 8, lines 18-20, page 12, lines 15-18). It is further noted that the specification states in each case that "the crude extracts can be further refined, to meet the requirements in terms of the contents" of the compounds.

Guo et al. teaches a composition comprising extracts of *Astragalus mongholicus*, *Salvia miltiorrhiza*, pseudoginseng (*Panax pseudoginseng*) and oil of Jiangxiang.

Therefore the reference is deemed to anticipate the instant claims above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guo et al. (CN 1375316, Derwent abstract provided).

A composition comprising Radix Salviae Miltiorrhizae (*Salvia miltiorrhiza*) extract, Radix Notoginseng (*Panax notoginseng* or *Panax pseudoginseng*), Radix Astragali (*Astragalus* species) extract and borneol or oil of Lignum Dalbergiae Odoriferae (oil of

Dalbergia wood or jiangxiang) is claimed. It is noted that each of the radix components are defined in the specification such that, "the content of the extracts falls within the scopes [of chemical compounds] as listed" (see page 5, lines 27-29, page 8, lines 18-20, page 12, lines 15-18). It is further noted that the specification states in each case that "the crude extracts can be further refined, to meet the requirements in terms of the contents" of the compounds. Dependent claims include several ranges of percentages for each of the four components, particular chemical compounds found in each component, and different dosage formulations.

Guo et al. beneficially teaches a composition comprising extracts of *Astragalus mongholicus*, *Salvia miltiorrhiza*, pseudoginseng (*Panax pseudoginseng*) and oil of Jiangxiang.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to increase the amount all the beneficial compounds found in each component and to adjust the percentage of each component to achieve the most therapeutically effective composition as taught by Guo et al. The adjustment of particular conventional working conditions (e.g., determining the most beneficial combination of components and/or the chemical compounds intrinsically contained therein and/or choosing suitable dosage formulations) is deemed merely a matter of judicious selection and routine optimization which is well within the purview of the skilled artisan.

From the teachings of the references, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed

Art Unit: 1655

invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole was *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Heather Anderson whose telephone number is (571) 270-3051. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:30 AM-5:00 PM, ALT. Friday, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terry KcKelvey can be reached on (571) 272-0775. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 1655

HLA



CHRISTOPHER R. TATE
PRIMARY EXAMINER